

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 6, 2010. Claims 1, 20 to 22, 41 to 43, 46, 50 and 54 remain pending in the application, with Claims 52 and 56 to 64 having been canceled. Claims 1, 22, 43 and 46 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 20, 21, 50, 52 and 57 to 60 were objected to for an informality. The pending claims have been amended in keeping with the suggestion at page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections.

Claims 1, 20 to 22, 41 to 43, 46, 50, 52, 54 and 56 to 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Japanese Publication No. 2000-259563 (Yuichi)¹ in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,031 (Watanabe). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The claims concern sending e-mails that include status information about an apparatus. According to the claims, data is sent to a computer for enabling a user to input a plurality of different sets of information. Each set of information includes a transmit destination to which an e-mail is to be transmitted, a language in which to create the e-mail, a reply destination to which a reply to the e-mail is to be transmitted from the transmit destination, and a condition in which the e-mail is to be transmitted.

According to one aspect of the claims, if a status of the apparatus corresponds to a first condition included in a first set of information, a first e-mail including a first reply destination is transmitted to a first transmit destination. On the other hand, if the status of the

^{1/} Applicant notes that the Office Action misidentifies Yuichi as Japanese Publication No. 2000-259583.

apparatus corresponds to a second condition included in a second set of information, a second e-mail including a second reply destination is transmitted to a second transmit destination.

By virtue of the foregoing arrangement, it is ordinarily possible to transmit e-mails including different reply destinations to different transmit destinations for respectively different conditions of the apparatus.

Referring specifically to the claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a communication controller for controlling communication between an apparatus and a computer. A sending unit of the communication controller is constructed to send data to the computer for enabling a user of the computer to input a plurality of different sets of information. Each set of information includes a transmit destination to which an e-mail is to be transmitted, a language in which to create the e-mail, a reply destination to which a reply to the e-mail is to be transmitted from the transmit destination, and a condition in which the e-mail is to be transmitted from the communication controller. The plurality of different sets of information input by the user based on the data sent to the computer are received from the computer by a receiving unit of the communication controller.

An obtaining unit of the communication controller is constructed to obtain a status of the apparatus. If the status of the apparatus obtained by the obtaining unit corresponds to a first condition included in a first set of information received by the receiving unit, a first email is created by a creating unit. The first email has a body including information which describes the status obtained by the obtaining unit in a first language included in the first set of information and a header including a first reply destination included in the first set of information. If the status of the apparatus obtained by the obtaining unit corresponds to a second condition included in a second set of information received by the receiving unit, the creating unit creates a second email

which has a body including information which describes the status obtained by the obtaining unit in a second language included in the second set of information and a header including a second reply destination included in the second set of information.

If the status of the apparatus obtained by the obtaining unit corresponds to the first condition included in the first set of information received by the receiving unit, a transmitting unit transmits the first e-mail created by the creating unit to a first transmit destination included in the first set of information. On the other hand, if the status of the apparatus obtained by the obtaining unit corresponds to the second condition included in the second set of information received by the receiving unit, the transmitting unit transmits the second email created by the creating unit to a second transmit destination included in the second set of information.

Claims 22, 43 and 46 are directed to an apparatus, a method, and a computer readable storage medium, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or suggest the features of the claims, and in particular is not seen to disclose or suggest at least the feature of transmitting a first email including a first reply destination to a first transmit destination if a status of an apparatus corresponds to a first condition, and transmitting a second email including a second reply destination to a second transmit destination if the status of the apparatus corresponds to a second condition.

Yuichi is seen to disclose that an NMS (network management system) 200 detects a failure on a network 100, and a server 300 generates failure information concerning the failure detected by the NMS 200 in a format suitable for a notification media owned by a user to which the failure should be notified. Server 300 is seen to notify the generated failure information to a notification destination of the user to which the failure should be notified.

However, Yuichi is not seen to disclose or suggest that a status of an apparatus corresponds to first and second conditions. The only status seen to be disclosed in Yuichi is that there has been a failure on network 100. Moreover, Yuichi is not seen to disclose transmitting a first notification including a first reply destination to a first notification destination if a status of an apparatus corresponds to a first condition, and transmitting a second notification including a second reply destination to a second notification destination if the status of the apparatus corresponds to a second condition.

Accordingly, Yuichi is not seen to disclose or suggest transmitting a first email including a first reply destination to a first transmit destination if a status of an apparatus corresponds to a first condition, and transmitting a second email including a second reply destination to a second transmit destination if the status of the apparatus corresponds to a second condition.

Watanabe is seen to disclose a network photograph service system that transmits electronic mail with attached images. A user of the system selects images to be transmitted with an electronic mail. In addition, the user can input a destination address, a comment and a sender's address for the electronic mail. See Watanabe, column 8, lines 4 to 34. However, neither the destination address nor the sender's address in Watanabe are seen to relate to a status of an apparatus corresponding to a first or second condition.

Accordingly, as with Yuichi, Watanabe is not seen to disclose or suggest transmitting a first email including a first reply destination to a first transmit destination if a status of an apparatus corresponds to a first condition, and transmitting a second email including a second reply destination to a second transmit destination if the status of the apparatus corresponds to a second condition.

In light of the above-noted deficiency of Yuichi and Watanabe, as well as other deficiencies relative to the current claim language, it is further respectfully submitted that a combination of Yuichi and Watanabe would not share the advantageous effects of the arrangement claimed herein. For example, such a combination would not share the advantageous effect of ordinarily transmitting e-mails including different reply destinations to different transmit destinations for respectively different conditions of an apparatus.

In view of the foregoing, independent Claims 1, 22, 43 and 46 are believed to be allowable over Yuichi and Watanabe.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel G. Barry/

Daniel G. Barry

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No.: 65,423

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10104-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 4782504v1